

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO
019053.000112

PATENT
U.S. 10/817,452

Remarks/ Arguments

In response to the Office Action mailed June 13, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objections to the specification and the rejections of the claims.

Claims 1-15 remain.

Claims 1 and 8 are being amended.

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract as it currently stands on the grounds that it does not meet the requirements of MPEP § 608.01(b). Applicant has replaced the Abstract with an Abstract that complies with the requirements of MPEP § 608.01(b).

The drawings stand objected to, on two grounds. First, the Examiner notes that the angle in claim 1 is not designated by a reference numeral or character. Second, the Examiner submits that the drawings are inconsistent with the claims and specification to the extent that the figures do not show that the grip may be made of rubber or plastic.

Applicant submits herewith, a redlined drawing indicating the proposed changes to Figure 2 of the drawings. Applicant proposes to add shading or cross hatching to Figure 2 indicating that the body of the handgrip may be made of plastic, chrome, or rubber. Additionally, Applicant proposes to add the reference line shown in Figure 2 which extends longitudinally through the ends of protrusions illustrating the angle between the midline of the tubular body of the handgrip and the rotation of the protrusions with respect to the midline.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Heap*. (U.S. Patent 6,261,141) (hereinafter "the *Heap* reference"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO
019053.000112

PATENT
U.S. 10/817,452

Anticipation rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) require identity of invention. In other words, the Examiner has the burden of identifying, *prima facie*, each and every feature of each and every claim rejected as anticipated in a single prior art reference.

Applicant respectfully notes that the *Heap* reference does not teach first and second tapered protrusions having longitudinal midlines which are rotated at an angle to the midline of a generally tubular body and which have longitudinal midlines which are generally parallel to each other. In contrast, the kayak paddle of the *Heap* reference, generally shown in Figures 1 and 1A, includes raised protrusions 12 and 14, each of which have a longitudinal axis which is generally aligned with the longitudinal axis of paddle shaft 16. In other words, neither the longitudinal axis of protrusion 12 nor protrusion 14 is rotated with respect to the longitudinal axis of paddle shaft 16. Applicant also notes that the angle 50 shown in Figure 6 of the *Heap* reference generally shows the vertical height or thickness of the given grip 12 or 14. Applicant further notes that angle 23 as shown in Figure 4A does not define rotations with respect to structures on individual grip 14, but instead only shows the relationship between the separate left and right hand grips 12 and 14 when attached to shaft 16 of the kayak paddle.

Given the substantial differences between Claims 1-15, and the teachings of the *Heap* reference, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of Claims 1-15 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 8, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Johnson*. (U.S. Patent Des. 248,616) (hereinafter "the *Johnson* reference"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections on the grounds that the *Johnson* reference also does not disclose the identical invention.

Specifically, the *Johnson* reference does not disclose a handgrip with protrusions, as claimed, on both the front and back sides. The *Johnson* reference only discloses a protrusion with a contoured upper surface on the back side of the handgrip.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO
019053.000112

PATENT
U.S. 10/817,452

Claims 5 -17 and 12-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Heap* reference in further view of *Roark* (U.S. Patent 5,823,069) (hereinafter "*Roark* reference"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The differences between the *Heap* reference and the present claims have been described in detail above. These differences are not remedied by the teachings of the *Roark* reference. Specifically, while the *Roark* reference discloses in Figure 2, a grip which includes protrusions, as similar to the *Heap* reference, the longitudinal axes of those protrusions are not rotated with respect to the center line of the tubular body. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that the rejections of Claims 5-17 and 12-14 as obvious in view of the *Heap*, and the *Roark* references should be withdrawn.


No new matter has been added; the claims have been merely amended to more particularly claim the subject matter Applicant believes is inventive. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as they now stand are patentably distinct over the art cited during the prosecution thereof.

With the addition of no new claims, no additional filing fees are due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 20-0821 of Thompson & Knight LLP.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this paper or the present application in general, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (214) 969 - 1749.

Respectfully submitted,

Thompson & Knight LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 
James J. Murphy
Reg. No. 34,503

1700 Pacific Avenue
Suite 3300

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO
019053.000112

PATENT
U.S. 10/817,452

Dallas TX. 75201 - 4693

Date: July 12, 2005